
E. Cancio attended for D. Munk.; B. Cummings attended for P. Smith; D. Clinton attended for S. Webber; F. Giodano attended for S. Wickman

Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was present.

THOSE FACULTY SENATE MEMBERS NOT PRESENT: Arriola, Crisler, Cummings, Engel, Finkelstine, Frank-Stromborg, Garcia, Ghayeb, Greene, Jeffrey, Johnson, Kahn, Kang, Kolb, Loubere, Mehrer, Payvar, Pierce, S. Song, X. Song, Spear, Wade, Wang, Windelborn

I. CALL TO ORDER

President Willis: I’d like to call the meeting to order.

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 P.M.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

President Willis: Can I have a motion to adopt the agenda? All right, I have a motion. Can I have a second? Okay. It’s moved and seconded that we adopt the agenda. Are there any changes or additions or comments or anything like that? If not, motion to approve the agenda – all those in favor of approving the agenda say aye. Opposed?

The agenda was approved.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 1, 2003 FS MEETING (Pages 3-5)

President Willis: On pages 3-5 you will find the minutes of our last meeting on the first of October. Can I have a motion to approve the minutes? Okay. Second? Okay, any discussion or additions or corrections to the minutes? Okay. All those in favor of approving the minutes say aye. Opposed?
The minutes were approved.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

President Willis: I don’t have too much in the way of announcements because the thing I think people are most interested in is the budget and nobody knows anything about the budget at this point. At our next meeting I have asked Kathy Buettner to come. She is our legislative liaison. She spends most of her time between here and Springfield and Washington dealing with all these legislators. She is very highly respected, particularly in the state by the other state universities because of her ability to communicate and to advocate for the university, so I thought I would have her come and talk to us at our November meeting because at that point, the veto session – if it isn’t over, it will certainly be well underway – and there will actually be things to talk about whereas right now, there are only so many different ways you can say “we don’t know”. So she will be coming next time, as I say, her specialty is legislation at both the state and national level. If you have any questions that you can think of that you would like to ask her, feel free to send to me ahead of time and then I can send them to her and if she needs to do any reading up or anything like that, she can do that. Of course, also feel free to ask questions that come to you at the time.

I don’t think I have anything – I was going to see if there was anything that came up at University Council that we ought to know about. The recommendation for the Advisory Board of Technology Services went to the University Council’s University Affairs Committee. What they recommended was not that a new committee be formed but that the charge of the old committee be expanded so that they would be much more pro-active in looking at things ahead of time and trying to ensure that changes that are made don’t have to be undone or remade or something like that. I don’t recall the exact wording now but the Council did pass that working which was essentially what the charge to the new committee was and it is now in the Committee’s book so that committee now has a new mandate along the lines of what this body had asked for. I talked to Wally Czerniak several times. He, you know, doesn’t want to do things that are a nuisance to people anymore than anybody else does so I’m going to go to the next few meetings of that committee myself just so I know what’s going on and so we can establish some level of communication. This also got me to thinking about the whole issue of university – well, of the committees that are in the Committee’s book because if you look at the categories, there’s committees that report directly to the University Council, which I understand, and there’s committees that report indirectly to the University Council which I do not understand and then there are committees that are not normally under the jurisdiction of the University Council which I don’t understand either particularly what that means for committees that are under the jurisdiction of the University Council which is presumably some of the rest of them. Then there are other committees so I think that – I called Jerry Zar – I sent him an e-mail and said, you know, can you give me – shed any light on this and he said well, you know, these categories have been around forever. It is, yes, it’s a very long-standing tradition so I am thinking of revisiting those and establishing maybe two categories of committees, one which the University Council and perhaps the Faculty Senate would like to hear from on a fairly regular basis and one which we don’t care about so much. You know, I call it that but – you know, I figure we would want to be in reasonably good communication with the Graduate Council and the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual Advisor Committee or whatever they’re called.
Probably things like the Parking Appeals Committee and things like that we don’t necessarily need to hear from quite as often unless they have some kind of uproar in which case I’m sure we will hear from them or at least from the people who are interacting with them. Anyway, I will look at all those committees and what I would like to do is for committees which I think ought to be communicating on a regular basis, I would like to set up some path of communication because at the moment there is none. For example, this Computing Facilities Advisory Committee or whatever it is is listed as a committee that reports indirectly to University Council but there isn’t any path that leads from it that leads to the University Council, even indirectly as far as I can tell. So I’d not to, not just for that committee, but for all the ones particularly that we have a significant interest in. I’d like to see if I can see where communications could be improved because I think communications are key and I think most of the problem that we were addressing with this Computing Committee was communication, you know. It’s not like anybody on either side is stupid. The IT people know what they’re doing; they’re very good with computers. The faculty know what they’re doing. They know how to do research and teach their classes and all that kind of thing, it’s just that they aren’t talking to each other to find out what’s going to be convenient and what might want to wait for awhile or what we discussed or whatever. I’m going to see if I can focus on improving the communication somehow. All right. Now I really don’t have anything more to say.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

President Willis: We don’t have anything under Items for Faculty Senate Consideration or the Consent Agenda so we can move to reports from Advisory Committees and Pat has a walk-in which should be on your tables.

A. FAC to IBHE – Patricia Henry – report

P. Henry: Yes, thank you. This is sort of by way of an interim report. Earlier in the month as those of you who were at University Council know, the FAC (Faculty Advisory Council) met with the IBHE at their meeting in Edwardsville. We had lunch then with the IBHE members and Chairman Kaplan sort of challenged us to come up with ideas to increase faculty productivity and we’re all a little concerned about that. He voiced it in terms of being parallel to the cuts in administration that had been done in the past year and that the increases in tuition was sort of the way students had contributed and that this was a way for us to have input in terms of how the faculty could contribute to addressing the budget deficit as it exits. It’s not altogether clear whether the Faculty Advisory Committee is really the way in which to do this and we all sort of went back, especially the public representatives, went back to our home campuses and conferred with provosts and so forth – presidents – and got together then a couple of weeks ago in Springfield to sort of brainstorm about at least coming up with some kind of report or document that would help, at least for us, clarify the issues and hopefully educate the IBHE as to what some of issues that we saw as issues were. It’s also – I mean it’s not clear that the IBHE will listen to us and that if the IBHE does listen to us that the legislature will listen to the IBHE or the
administration but there does seem to be a concern – both the state, and if you followed the national news, this has come up in the US Congress as well that the notion that faculty are not really doing their share and that this is part of the reason that tuition keeps going up. This is something I think that we have to sort of life with. In trying to counter that, the various members of the FAC have been developing a number of position papers and I have listed them for you there. “Understanding the dynamics of 21st century faculty productivity, roles and responsibilities; possibilities for long-term resolution of higher education funding issues” which many of us feels needs to be addressed but which politically speaking, probably won’t be; “the effects of the prior budget reductions to higher education in Illinois” that we’ve already undergone. I think this is something that bears repeating that the cutting and cutting has already happened and that it’s a little hard to find more things to cut and so forth. Another aspect of it that I would really appreciate getting some feedback on especially from those of you who deal with students or from student directly – how the budget reductions have already effected students and what kind of education they can get. We’re sort of going to pull all those together and present them to the IBHE. We’ll work on them a little bit. Next week we’ll meet at Northeastern Illinois University. The issue that I particularly wanted to bring to your attention is this resolution that is just a draft as yet, reviving PQP which some of you may recall back in – several, many years ago – I think it was about six years ago or something or longer, priorities, quality and productivity was a notion that came down from the IBHE that while it had its drawbacks, in fact, I don’t remember those as happy times, did provide for some shared voice – institutional voice – in making known what it is that we need to restructure or what it is that, given what our particular strengths are, we need to protect and that that is an important thing to keep in mind for the IBHE as it is looking over this whole situation rather than just sort of saying oh, let’s cut here; let’s cut there. The IBHE, we feel, needs input from the universities as well. So that’s – any input or feedback or other concerns that you have, I would be very happy to pass on to the FAC.

B. Goldenberg: Bill Goldenberg from Music. I just wanted to ask a question. I read through this quickly and the working is possible the way it is but I wondered if there was a typo or if it wouldn’t sound better if the second sentence “That mechanism enables individual institutions utilizing the shared governance process to make optimal decisions” – you don’t mean optional I don’t think. I don’t think that would look as good as optimal.

P. Henry: It should be optimal. It would be nice if they were optional. Thank you.

J. Lockard: Given the history that many of us remember of PQP, I’m wondering if there might be a way of renaming this thing to avoid the negative connotations of the past? That would be one thing. The second thing would be to make sure as best you can that this time it is a bottom up process rather than some imbecile at IHBE imposing it on the rest of the state.

P. Henry: I will certainly pass that on. Go ahead.

B. Tolhurst: Having been a department chair during PQP, it seems to me that significant changes were made, at least in my college during that. The college made a very strenuous and, in my view, very effective attempt to eliminate administrative costs where it was clear they were unjustified and there were some that were unjustified – of course, not in my department. It strikes me as somewhat bizarre to think that we have been in such flush times since that we could
reinstate waste and so I think that before we reinstate PQP, what we ought to do is consider what was achieved not only through PQP but through other efforts to reduce membership on committees. Now, with regard to faculty productivity, if I understand productivity correctly, productivity consists in the ratio of work done to time spent doing it. It seems to me, having seen a great deal of faculty activity reports, that a great many of our faculty put in a great many hours and I would encourage them to demonstrate that we are more productive by getting that work done in fewer hours and reflecting it on our faculty activity reports and thereby provide the IBHE with yet more evidence that it can ignore as it did indeed ignore the evidence provided during the PQP process. One of the most frustrating things about that process is we had bottom up development of information which was summarily ignored by those who were supposed to be using it to make decisions and I’m not eager to go through that process again as a faculty member much less those who are chairs during that period and have to deal with that kind of stuff. It was not an effort made in good faith in my view and I have no interest in revisiting it again in that form.

P. Henry: I hasten to add that I don’t think anybody at the FAC thinks it was that great either. It was just that at least it had some involvement which, as you point out, was to a greater extent than it should have been, ignored. So I will very much convey the concern that it should not be ignored if we have to do anything like that again.

President Willis: If I could add, I think that both Bill and Jim had the right point that a bottom up process is a good thing and, indeed, it’s not like we sit around figuring out how to waste money or not even think about how to be efficient – we do, but it was fairly clear I think from the letter that was written in the communication that was given to the FAC which was that if we did not engage in a bottom up process, there would be a top down process imposed and we were going to like it about as much as we liked PQP probably or maybe less.

P. Henry: By any other name.

President Willis: Whatever. So I think if the FAC would endorse anything and perhaps calling it PQP is not the best strategy, I mean, I don’t think we want to give them the idea that we actually liked that, but something that, as the rest of the description says, “enables individual institutions” to do the best they can with what they have. That would be a good thing. I mean, I think everybody understands that things are tight and getting tighter and obviously we’ll all have to figure out how to function but we’d rather figure it out ourselves rather than have them tell us how to do it.

P. Henry: Just to add – the things that I’ve bullet pointed up there I will pass on to you once we’ve sort of cooked it down a little bit. Indeed, especially the issues of what is productivity and how it is either misunderstood or poorly defined by various groups, is one of the issues that is being addressed and hopefully something more articulate will come out of it.

J. Hurych: Jitka Hurych, University Libraries. I would like to remind us that there was also some very negative and shortsighted decisions made during PQP. I was also here and one of them was closing the Department of Library and Information Science because that was the only program here in Northern Illinois that served, the state university, that served the population
from Chicago and now they’re constantly talking about recruiting minorities and that was definitely one place where we could have done more and we closed this. I mean, the previous administration – I heard later then – they said it was a mistake.

P. Henry: Well, too late now.

J. Hurych: Exactly. So, I also when I see PQP I have that really sinking feeling.

President Willis: As I recall, they went after a lot of stuff at that time. They tried to get the Law School and about half a dozen Ph.D. programs and all that kind of thing, most of which we were able to dissuade them from doing but it was not a pleasant experience. Okay, anything else for Pat? Okay. Just one side point I wanted to make about this whole thing. This is taking place between James Kaplan who’s the Chairman of IBHE and the Faculty Advisory Committee. Nobody else at the university is involved or has been contacted yet. IBHE staff as far as I know is not involved so it’s a somewhat peculiar way of doing business. I think at some point they would want to talk to the university administration, you know if they are going about reorganizing the school.

P. Henry: Many of us felt this way as well and it was put in terms of this is a very preliminary process but we’re not comfortable with it either.

B. Tolhurst: The more I think about this, the more upset I get. As a matter of fact, the university is under extreme financial stress. We’re giving back large chunks of our budget. What do they think happens when we do that? Don’t they think that we’re already making decisions about our priorities? We can’t do what we used to do. We have to decide what’s important and do less and why do they think that establishing an IBHE process over and above what our governor is already doing for us will improve this process or do anything but add confusion?

P. Henry: The way it was put to us by Chairman Kaplan was that the deficit is there; we have to deal with it and I think there may be a feeling on the IBHE’s part that this is something they need to do in order to prove that they’re doing something so I wouldn’t want to say to much more than that ---- I think that’s part of where the directive comes from.

B. Tolhurst: Tell them what we have already done and to keep up the good work.

P. Henry: We will definitely push that forward.

President Willis: I did read the letter – James Kaplan wrote a letter to the university presidents after he had this discussion with the FAC king of explaining what it was he had asked them although he didn’t really ask for their input much. I didn’t bring it with me but there’s a phrase in that letter that said something as had been done with administration and other costs that – you know, faculty should look to, you know, reallocating resources to higher priority items and I’m thinking “higher than what?” I thought we just cut all this administration so we could put it into instruction, you know? So there’s a certain amount of nonsense about all this. Yes?

B. Miller: I do a lot of work with assessment and assessing faculty roles and, you know, it
seems to me that there is missing in this conversation at least, an element of good faith. We are asked to continually assess ourselves on an annual basis through faculty service reports. We do those very strange, semester allocations and resource forms where we document how many minutes or hours we work per week and how many hours we spend with our students and how many hours we spend in preparation which doesn’t make any sense at all as far as I’m concerned but we do them every time. Then we do an assessment every year for tenure and merit. Tenure track people do them for that kind of thing. So, we are continually doing productivity reports. Then someone, I assume, is doing some kind of collective measurement of that.

**President Willis:** I wouldn’t be too hasty to assume that personally.

**B. Miller:** Well, somebody is ---

**B. Tolhurst:** If they are we have no idea what it is.

**B. Miller:** Well, we are also, I believe, as a whole a reflective group of people. That is why we are scholars. We tend to be a bunch of reflective people. We may not always communicate that as clearly to legislators as they would like or in language that they would like and perhaps that is one of the things that we have not been as good at – language that legislators need – but we know that we aren’t sitting around not doing anything. I don’t know any faculty member who spends less than 40 hours a week doing their job. I think that there is this frustration about being looked upon as not being in good faith with the university that flies in their face when we are asked to do more and then we are told, “you’re not being productive”. That is hurtful and I think that is why when we’re asked to do some other level of processing that, both with the legislators and the IBHE folks, that’s not being communicated very clearly. You know, the only way from my field of study that I can say that it hurts. We give all that we can give to our students and to our jobs and our scholarship in our research. We spend hours and hours and hours. I’ve been told actually be careful how many hours you put down because nobody will believe it. You know, you work on the weekends; you work nights. My parents call and say “are you still working?” – yes. You know, how many hours we bring papers in. We work while we’re in a meeting, grading, you know, and yet we are told we aren’t giving credit and I think – I don’t know exactly how to communicate with it other than say “I’d love for the Governor to come spend a day with me”. Let him come count the fact that we don’t have enough pencils in our offices, you know, and just share to some extent the fact that when we are asked to put on a line the fact that we are not being given credit for the work we do that we feel some element of shame and we feel some element that we are not being heard.

**President Willis:** Yes?

**C. Booth:** Colin Booth from Geology. My recollection of PQP was somewhat colored by the fact that we were defending our Ph.D. program. As it turned out, successfully at the time. More importantly, PQP was an incredibly time demanding process from the point of view of faculty who were involved in it. It seems to me if they’re trying to address the issues of productivity of the faculty including another layer of administrative time demanding process in this, it’s a definite reduction in productivity so I would suggest the biggest message we could send is let’s have few of these sort of things and let’s get on with our jobs.
B. Tolhurst: It’s an administrative cost – assessment is an administrative cost.

P. Henry: I should point out that actually the IBHE is not pushing PQP and I just – and I’m not sure if I completely agree with the FAC’s position on this either, because I too, have no good memories of this – but I think they are trying to put up some sort of buffer between just top down decisions and some kind of way of indeed communicating and, believe me, I wish a very good way of doing that.

B. Tolhurst: If this is coming from the FAC to the IBHE I am appalled because the FAC is asking the IBHE to impose this administrative cost on us. I’d rather deal with summary cuts that we couldn’t have done anything about and not waste my time trying to convince them to do it when I know they won’t pay any attention to what I’ve spent my time doing to convince them.

President Willis: Well, I believe – and Pat can speak to this – but I believe this was in response to a request from the IBHE to, you know, they’re going to be looking at faculty productivity and if we wanted to have say about it, we ought to say it otherwise they were going to say it for us essentially.

P. Henry: That’s basically it.

President Willis: I know it is tedious. Yes, David?

D. Wagner: As I read this, the FAC is considering the following resolution and as I understood the discussion today, this body opposes that and you should be instructed in that way. Probably doesn’t need a formal thing but ---

P. Henry: I’ll pass that on.

President Willis: Yes, Bill?

B. Goldenberg: Nonetheless, I’m quite sure that the university could send information, which it already has, to the IBHE. Our President is quite good at defending us and our productivity and I see no reason why we couldn’t provide them with the information, which we already have ---

President Willis: And which we’ve already provided.

B. Goldenberg: We don’t have to let them make a decision without forcing them to ignore the evidence.

President Willis: Which they’re quite willing to do as far as I can tell.

J. Stephen: I’m just amazed. They’re measuring by pounds here. I mean, the more paper you produce, the more quality and productivity they hope to have. Maybe we should start doing daily reports.
President Willis: Apparently also there is rearing it’s ugly head again, a sentiment in the legislature and also apparently this is getting to be more and more unusual among the states – that they’re saying “well, you know, we pay you to teach undergraduates and anything else you want to do is on your own nickel”. Most states have moved away from that and recognized that higher education consists of a lot more than just teaching undergraduates but that’s a difficult stumbling block to get over when people just kind of repute it and won’t go away. Yes, Bill?

B. Tolhurst: One of the things I did when I was chair was to do a cross study of our master’s program and the graduate assistants associated with it many of whom were largely funded by federal work study money paid for itself. The costs that would be incurred to teach the undergraduates if our M.A. program were eliminated would be higher than the costs we currently incur in GR dollars.

President Willis: Right. Well, the President actually suggested that maybe we should cut our undergraduate enrollment until it matches the money that they’re giving us because they’re not giving us enough money to support the undergraduates that we have even. But that’s an ongoing discussion. All right, anything else for Pat? So I believe you got a sense of the ---

B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Paul Loubere and William Tolhurst – no report

C. BOT Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee – Sue Willis and Xueshu Song – no report

D. BOT Legislation, Audit and External Affairs Committee – Sara Clayton and Beverly Espe – no report

E. BOT – Sue Willis – no report

VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Academic Affairs Committee – William Baker, Chair – report (Pages 6-11)

President Willis: I believe none of the Board of Trustees Committees have met so we can move on to Academic Affairs. Bill Baker?

B. Baker: I’d like to draw the Senate’s attention to the following. There’s quite a bit from us in the package. There is Sandy Flood’s report to Provost Legg, October 2003, which you’ll find on pages 8 through 11. That’s number one. Secondly, I’d like to draw Senate’s attention to the minutes on page 6 of a meeting which we had, the Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee, on October 15, 2003. Now I think that those minutes try to reflect the great diversity of opinion, which was reflected at our meeting. I’d like in particular to draw your attention to two areas on page 6. One are the comments of Professor Wagner who, if you’ll go to paragraph two, suggested among several things, “that any document approved by the Committee might address whether an increase in non-tenure track faculty (in proportion to tenure track faculty) was desirable, even if it is inevitable for the time being”. Secondly, I’d like to draw Senate’s
attention to the ultimate paragraph, “Sue Willis suggested that it would be possible if the Committee decided to give non-tenure track faculty formal representation in Faculty Senate” and that’s a matter for our consideration. Would you like to add anything?

**President Willis:** Well, that would be the decision of the entire Senate obviously and I must confess I have not looked into exactly how that might be done but it’s, you know, if the Senate wishes we can certainly work on it. As far as I can tell, the non-tenure track faculty are really not represented anywhere because they’re not here. They’re not on the University Council because they’re classified as faculty; they’re not SPS, they’re not operation staff so they’re not really represented on any of the major governing bodies of the university and it seems like they ought to have a voice somewhere. Yes?

**J. Stephen:** As I recall from the discussions when the union contract came through, that they’re limited in their abilities to serve on such committees?

**President Willis:** There are details of that that I don’t understand. That’s one of the things that I want to sort out.

**J. Stephen:** In fact, I think we’re not allowed to have them serve on committees.

**President Willis:** They are allowed to serve on committees. I believe they cannot be required to serve on committees without extra compensation but, if they want to it without extra compensation, I think that’s not a problem.

**J. Stephen:** My experience is those people are already quite productive.

**President Willis:** Yes, this is not going to enhance their productivity any. This is more about representation and that’s an issue at least with some of them and, you know, I’m not thinking in terms of fifty of them. I was thinking like one or two.

**J. Stephen:** I don’t have any problem with their representation.

**President Willis:** I would have to talk with – well, and Sandy Flood is the president of the union. She’s the one who brought it up so I figured somehow it must be possible.

**J. Stephen:** Okay.

**B. Baker:** Do we want to have a motion or not? Or is that over-simplifying matters?

**President Willis:** Well, is that – why don’t we get to that at the end. Do you have other things you want to discuss before that?

**B. Baker:** I think that David Wagner would want to comment because that was something he felt rather strongly about – the other matter which is in the minutes.
D. Wagner: Well, yeah, I guess that sometimes I get overly strong, but Sue Willis’s statement on page 7 was really written to address the concerns that I had that are sort of more rational perhaps than I was at the committee meeting. But, you know, it at least addresses that this is a bad thing and hopefully a temporary thing and it seems to me her statement answers the concerns I had.

B. Baker: Thank you.

President Willis: I believe we were talking about giving this report to the Provost so perhaps the motion that the Senate endorse doing that would be appropriate. Okay, Bill just moved that. Is there a second? Okay, there’s a second. Any discussion on transmitting this to the Provost? Okay, all those in favor say aye. Opposed? All right, I will transmit it to the Provost. If you want to come back to the representation issue, that needs more background work. You know, it’s not anything we can actually do right now. If you’d like to make a motion just to get a sense of the Senate that that would be an appropriate thing to do. I think that would be reasonable. All right, so the motion is to look further into the idea of having some non-tenure track faculty representation on the Faculty Senate. Is there any discussion of that? Yes?

J. Wolfskill: I’d really like to know what you mean when you say “look further into”?

President Willis: See what changes it would require in our bylaws. See what the constraints are on the non-tenure track faculty themselves from their contracts. Just in general see what would be involved and have a committee look at what representation they think would be appropriate. I think basically it’s a matter for the Rules and Governance Committee.

J. Wolfskill: So then the likely outcome of this after some time would be the Rules and Governance Committee would bring a specific proposal before this body?

President Willis: Yes. Yes, Beth?

B. Miller: You might just want to clarify for everybody who these people are.

President Willis: Well, there’s a wide variety of non-tenure track faculty. The ones who are in the union are non-tenure track faculty who are at least halftime and the people who are around halftime tend to float in and out of that category rapidly as they fall below 50% or move above it. There are also non-tenure track faculty who are less than 50%; they are not members of the union and often are hard to track because they may be teaching just one or two courses in an off-campus location or something like that. There are also adjunct faculty who teach a course here and there because of particular expertise. I know we used them in Physics; we have people coming over from Argonne and FermiLab to teach about their own particular specialty for a graduate class for example. They’re adjunct faculty and like the others they’re not tenure track. I think the ones about which we are most concerned are the ones that are full time or close to full time instructors here on campus because they’re the ones that need to be integrated most fully into the functioning of our departments and colleges and the ones that have the fewest other ties. For many of then this is there life, they have been here for twenty or thirty years on these one-year contracts and they, I believe, deserve to have a say in what’s going on. Yes, Bill?
B. Tolhurst: I would like to, however, point out something that is easily forgotten and that’s that the situation of temporaries of that sort can vary widely from department to department. We have a few; we have none who are long-term. We provide our temporaries with full assistantship help. We do not have them on our committees so they can get their research done and they typically go on to tenure track jobs within a year or two. It seems to me that, you know, I would hope that whatever approach is developed allows for a recognition of relevant differences amongst temporary of this sort who are full time and in the union, that there are the long-term temporary people and the people who are here and hope to be here and we hope they’re here for a short time not because we don’t value them, but we want them to have a better life and we want to help them do it.

President Willis: Right and I am aware of that and I appreciate you pointing it out. I did send an e-mail out to all the department chairs asking them what the situation of tenure track faculty was in their departments and a number of them replied just as you did. Of course, there are others where they’re the backbone of the teaching essentially, at the freshman level at least. That’s one of the problems with the non tenure track faculty is that they are so varied so it’s very hard to write down anything and say, you know, deal with them this way.

B. Tolhurst: As much as the union might like to.

President Willis: Or as we might like to. You know, it’s one of those things where you really just have to go case-to-case and remember to be nice. All right, any other discussion? Yes, Pat?

P. Henry: I really support this. I think it would be very good to have not only them here to talk to us but to listen to the kinds of concerns that would increase communication and provide for fewer misunderstandings I think.

President Willis: Okay, any other comments or discussion? All right, so all those in favor of charging probably Rules and Governance to investigate this further say aye. Opposed? Okay. The motion passed.

President Willis: I can see Gretchen grimacing back there. Bill, do you have anything else?

B. Baker: No, except at the next meeting – on the agenda is a further discussion of this plus the thorny grading issue when I get ‘round to it.

B. Economic Status of the Profession Committee – Jim Lockard, Chair

President Willis: All right, Economic Status of the Profession?

J. Lockard: We don’t have a formal report this time but I do want to draw your attention to two things that are continuation of the message I delivered to you last month. One is that within a few days of our meeting next month in which I reminded you of some of the things that have gone on in Springfield in an effort to find money to balance the state’s budget, an article
appeared in the *Tribune* on October 10 and it was called to my attention by one of my committee members. I do have an electronic copy of this if anyone would like to read it for themselves, but the headline in the *Tribune* was “Foundation Finds Itself in Odd State” and the essence of the story was in the first paragraph. “The budget balancing by Governor Blagojevich to force a large environmental foundation to surrender half its endowment to the state has alarmed environmental activists and philanthropists”. It’s a somewhat odd situation because the foundation is not the most typical in its structure as well. What caught my attention even more than all of that was about the fifth paragraph where the reporter says “a state legislator even wondered whether endowments such as the private foundations of state universities could be potential targets”. If anybody would like a copy of the whole article, I would be glad to share it with you. The other thing is that since I attempted to encourage you all to find out about and join the University Annuitants Association, a couple of people pointed out that if you look at the NIU annuitants’ part of the university web page, for practical purposes you’re led to believe that you are not eligible. It is badly done. I have spoken with the president of the organization who pledges to fix the website. It is open to anyone who belongs to SURS, which is everybody, and it is, as I said last time, the only way eighteen bucks will get you any legislative influence whatsoever in this state I think I read in the news. So do look into it but do not be misled by the appearance that it’s only for retirees. It’s for anybody who cares if they ever will have a retirement plan.

**President Willis:** Okay, any questions for Jim? Yes, Pat?

**P. Henry:** I was just wondering if you’ve heard anything further if in the veto session there’s talk of combining SURS with the other annuitants’ plans.

**J. Lockard:** Nothing more has come back. It’s still, to my knowledge, on the governor’s agenda personally – but where that will come, we don’t know. I was hoping that Kathy will have some information for us when she comes but it is not an active item at this point to the best of my knowledge.

**President Willis:** Yeah, Kathy’s the one who really knows the ins and outs of all that stuff so you can ask her when she’s here. In fact, I’ll write it down. All right, any other questions for Jim?

C. Resource, Space and Budget Committee – C. T. Lin Chair

**President Willis:** Okay, Resource, Space and Budget I believe has no report.

D. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee – Ngoyi Burkonda, Chair – report
   (Pages 12-16)

**President Willis:** Faculty Rights and Responsibilities, Ngoyi?

**N. Burkonda:** Yes, I am Ngoyi Burkonda, Chair of the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee. I’d like the attention of the Senate on page – the report that is included on page 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16 of the package. In this report we provide a response to a charge that was given us early this year. This was before I became myself a member of this committee and I was...
pleased to join the other members of the committee to work on that charge. The report I was referring to gives some background on the charge and also lists some of the work we did as a committee to address our responsibility. You’ll find on page 13 in particular a list of same examples of what we consider egregious behavior and which will need some work on the part of the university as an institution. I also call the attention of the Senate to the second part of our work, which involved some investigation. We did two types of investigation, one was just to look at some situations at higher education. From our survey of that area we were able to find that some institutions have in place a grievance procedure. So that students have a mechanism to address in appropriate faculty behavior. The second effort that we did was to conduct a survey of the various departments within our institution and from the result of that survey, we were able to find out that we don’t have in place – you have a summary of that survey on page 15 – we do have at NIU cases of students complaining of faculty behavior and we have found that no department has in place a formal policy for addressing this kind of situation. Most of the respondents in our survey claim that there is not any formal policy and also that even if they have a policy – a kind of informal policy – it is not well publicized. So, in conclusion with this work we are recommending or requesting the Faculty Senate to consider some action on your part, whatever you’d like, to send this forward to the University Council the recommendation about this situation and whatever can be done to address the situation will help to improve the reputation and the case to get some solution to their concerns. Thank you very much.

**President Willis:** Okay, Ngoyi would you like to make a motion that this be forwarded to the Council?

**N. Burkonda:** Yes.

**President Willis:** Okay. Is there a second to that motion? Okay. Discussion? Let me just say one thing, this is a problem that I have been aware of for some time and as also know and will hear as soon as Gretchen has her turn, is that we have, or in the process, of putting in place a unified grievance procedure for faculty and staff and so I think that the processes that procedure sets up are good ones and would encourage what other committee looks into doing a similar thing for students to use that as a model so far as possible. I suppose this is really an issue between faculty and students, the Council might decide that it would be better handled by the Senate but, you know, on the other hand we have students on the Council so it may be better handled there as well but we can certainly forward it to them and I’ll tell them they’ll have to figure something out. Any other discussion? David?

**D. Wagner:** Was the SA consulted? There is no reference, you know, that consultation with the Student Association Senate in the report. It seems to me, you know, that you would want to hear their voice.

**President Willis:** They’ve certainly expressed concerns in the past. I don’t know if the committee talked to them this time. This has been a bugaboo with them for a while also.

**N. Burkonda:** I may be missing that part, but from the time I joined this committee. Up to this we didn’t have any formal consultation with that body. I don’t know if some other member of the committee can correct me if I’m wrong.
President Willis: I also think that’s where the University Council would come in because there are student representatives there. Yes, Mark?

M. Cordes: I chaired the committee last year and we did not talk with any students last year but I think Sue is right. We anticipate that a broader-based group looking into this it would include students, faculty and perhaps administrators too.

President Willis: Yes?

J. Stephens: In our preparation of examples of misbehavior, I would point out that those examples paraphrase quite a large number of specific cases so this does, as a matter of fact, reflect student experience.

President Willis: Yes?

J. Hurych: I will ask an unpopular question. I understand that there should be policy in place and I would to commend the committee for a lot of work, but my question is is there also a policy that would deal with the reverse problem with a student’s – and I’m not saying that generally students do – but there are some that behave immaturely in the class, that are disruptive. What do you do about that?

President Willis: I think we already have policies for that. The Student Code of Conduct covers that. You may not have that on your favorite’s list like I do, but that is covered. Yes, Bill?

B. Baker: I find some of this rather disturbing, frankly, with elements almost of behavior police and almost McCarthyism. I really would like to know what kind of substantiated evidence is behind some of the allegations and, number two – firstly, and secondly what the contexts are. People could accuse x, y and z of anything. I think we are possibly taking things out of context, taking things, I don’t want to misquote it, far too seriously and elements of this really, really disturb me. I want some kind of evidence and without simply being unsubstantiated allegations.

President Willis: Well, yeah, I would – let me speak to that for a minute and then – I would – that’s a problem with any grievance procedure. We have the same discussion with the faculty and staff then. That’s why you set up a process to review case by case. Just because you have a process doesn’t mean that you’re assuming that there’s – or you’re saying yes, there’s a problem and we’re going to fix it it’s just that if something arises, then you have a panel that looks at it and makes a determination based on the evidence that there is and if there isn’t any, then they say sorry. But I think not to even have anything in place is a mistake because what if something does go on then what do you do? Yes, Bill?

B. Tolhurst: It strikes me that some of these issues are not best dealt with by a grievance procedure, at least a grievance procedure alone. It seems to me that plagiarism whether by faculty or students is unacceptable and we just need to put something in our Code of Ethics for faculty to make that clear so we’re on record. Secondly, if we are going to accept grievances for
certain offenses, we need to make those offenses known to the faculty. I know that when I was department chair, one of the important things I did was to listen to students who had complaints and, more often than not, the student would come in, I would listen and it was often something that one could not constructively do anything about at the time given the nature of the concern. So I always asked the student what he or she would like me to do and often the student said “well, I’m not sure there is anything that you can reasonably do but I wanted you to know” and I was glad and let them know I was glad they informed me because this was stuff I kept in mind and if there was a pattern I made sure the personnel committee knew about it so it could be taken into account during the evaluations and I let the student know that as well. So I think that where possible, it’s always better to handle these things through informal means and I know that people are not always willing to do that and it doesn’t get done and students are often abused and so we may need a grievance procedure but I share Bill Baker’s concerns that we do this carefully so not to create a problem bigger than the one we’re to solve.

President Willis: Right, right and I really expect that any procedure that got into place would be very strongly encourage and publicize to the students because all of them don’t know to go to their department chair.

B. Tolhurst: Now as far as forcing or pressuring graduate students to work over twenty hours a week on their assistantships, that’s just wrong. Is there no measure in place that can do something about that because they’re getting paid for twenty hours a week and if someone expects them to do more – and I’ve talked to the Graduate School about this. You can’t go with an average. You can’t say “well, you worked ten hours last week so you’ve got to do thirty this week”. That is not permitted by the Graduate School’s regulations and so there should be something in place to deal with that kind of problem.

President Willis: I don’t know. I don’t know if Tim knows. Apparently you can go to the Graduate School and they will say “no, you’re not supposed to do that” but – I think the idea here is not to create trouble for ourselves but rather to recognize that we should have a safety net somewhere just in case things do happen. We should have a process set up so we know how to handle situations that get out of hand and it should, obviously, start with not letting it get out of hand in the first place and dealing them if they do.

B. Tolhurst: There are a number of different kinds of problems. Maybe some problems are best handled in some ways and others best handled in others.

President Willis: Oh, absolutely. Yeah. But it would be good to have all those ways kind of collected somewhere so people, if they’re having problems, know where to look. Yes?

J. Stephens: The antidotal evidence did show that minor infractions are dealt with quite well and what we’re looking at here and what you’re referring to are actually very substantive reports which have to remain confidence; they are identifiable events in some cases and they are certainly things that practically everyone here would just be shocked about and they’re real and they’re very, very disturbing some of them and some of them are not dealt with at all and one of the problems about our referring to the Ethics Statement is there’s no implementation of anything
there. It’s prescriptive but it’s not in any way punitive or enforceable and some of these things definitely are things done by people I don’t want to be associated with.

President Willis: I think these are rare.

J. Stepens: Yes, they are.

President Willis: But, yeah – and many people may never encounter such a situation in their lifetime but this is a big place and we’ve got a lot of people here, you know, every once in awhile somebody acts like a jerk, I mean, it’s not unheard of. Okay. Yes?

L. Gregory: Larry Gregory from the School of Art. I’d like to make three points and first I want to agree fully with Professor Baker. This is dangerous. Secondly, to Bill Tolhurst, that’s exactly what I think we mean by an informal process and it’s exactly what I do in the School of Art and I am the person they come to and they’re so varied and the solutions are so varied and often you give somebody a sounding board and they go away feeling that a) they’ve had a chance to talk it out and b) we look for patterns and sometimes they don’t all happen in one semester and the student is not going to see a lot of action. The more important one I think, is that should this go to the Council, is there anyway we could get – perhaps on the Web or anyway you want to do it – whatever positive materials did come out of the committee’s search for descriptions of processes. Is there anything you can show us that’s positive that would help – take the department name off or whatever you want to do, but it would be helpful to see how others handle this or am I being led to believe that none of us have formal procedures and few could explain the informal procedures. That would be interesting to know too.

President Willis: As far as I know, there are no formal procedures in the sense of appeals and that kind of thing. There are informal procedures as you have described involving either the chair or someone designated by the chair, which are excellent. I don’t think there’s any suggestion here to get rid of those but rather to publicize them more because they’re not always well know. You know, the survey they did indicated that a lot of their publicity of this was done by word of mouth which is not, you know, not the best way to do it. As I said, that’s how you would like to do it with everything if possible, but the students need to know it’s available. Yeah?

L. Gregory: It does seem from our discussion here that education of the possibility of having someone to go talk to, PR if you want to call it that, really seems to be lacking and would be very helpful and perhaps one of the first things we should all just go back and look into in our own departments and see if, in fact, the representatives from the student groups understand. We don’t have student meetings. You talk to your own students in your own program but you don’t ever get to talk to all of them.

President Willis: Yes?

A. Powers: I’m just wondering about when these kind of issues are faced by faculty members, we go to the ombudsman so is that where the students are going now and what is the problem with that. Do we need a student ombudsman?
**President Willis:** Well, I think that if I – I don’t know if Tim wants to address that directly – but if I can address it. What the ombudsman – the ombudsman does not really fix anything so to speak. Am I representing that correctly? He’s basically a source of information. You know, he tells people what their options are and in the case of students, he mostly tells them they don’t have any options because we haven’t specified any.

**T. Griffin:** Now I will say something.

**President Willis:** I knew he’d come up somehow.

**T. Griffin:** If I may – for those of you who don’t know, I am Tim Griffin, the ombudsman here. We see in our office several hundred students a year who come to us with concerns about some type of issue or relationship that they have with a faculty member on campus. We do not – we are required by the Constitution and Bylaws of the University to be neutral parties. We cannot take sides or mandate solutions to anything. People who contact us including faculty members as Dr. Willis has said, receive their options. Those though are typically not “no” options. In the case of students who wish to take action or see something happen as the result of alleged treatment by a faculty member, they are limited to informal options and if they arise in the School of Art as Mr. Gregory has indicated, we would refer them to him to discuss the matter more locally to attempt to resolve it in a way that is informal and that is local. Some students decline to do that; some students are concerned about retaliation even at an informal stage most of whom I assume would also be concerned at taking formal action. We pride ourselves in being able to develop for individuals who consult with us not only formal options but informal options and resolutions prior to resorting to more formal steps.

**President Willis:** Yes, thank you Tim. I think that would be my vision of how this thing would work and it’s similar to what we have in the grievance procedure that we’re discussing for faculty and staff. To encourage settlement informally at the lowest possible level, but to have a process in place in case that doesn’t work. Back?

**J. Briscoe:** Jon Briscoe, Management. Can you hear me? Okay. I just want to add one voice for the students. I’ve had I don’t know how many students, I’ve only been here for four years, come to me with their frustration, usually from another department, sometimes from my own department because they can’t get anywhere and just from my relationship with them, I don’t normally see the behavior. A couple of times I did see the behavior and pretty outlandish behavior on the part of the faculty, usually relating to number 5, retaliatory behavior or 4, in response to that kind of behavior and I’ve been very frustrated that I couldn’t help them other than to sympathize with them and tell them to go talk to the department head or whatever department it was. So, I don’t know if this is the right vehicle but I think the deck is really stacked against them and what I’ve seen happen is when they do have a legitimate gripe is we circle the wagons and there’s like a – sort of almost like a code like we’re not going to get anyone else in trouble. I’ve had colleagues who’ve done things that I just find – I don’t think they go to the degree of some of these more serious things, but just things like not giving them a chance to get a good grade in retaliation instead of a more measured response and things like
that. So, I would personally really advocate seeing something for the students that provided them some legitimate avenue for complaint because I think the power scale right now is really imbalanced.

**President Willis:** Yes, Mark?

**M. Cordes:** Yeah, just to respond to a couple of points that first of all Tim’s office was the source of much of the information on page 13 but that has to be confidential obviously and I think this is a serious matter. At this point, I think we should treat these as allegations of conduct. We really don’t know whether all these things took place or not. I personally think certainly some of them likely did. They’re allegations but there has to be a process to address allegations. I think everybody on the committee would agree that it should start with an informal process and I think it seems to be fairly widespread that most of the departments have some sort of informal process. Certainly our sense is that that internal process works quite well in some departments and not very well in other ones and I think that’s one reason there needs to be a more formal grievance process in case the informal process is not working. Finally, I think whatever committee finally gets together and tries to put some meat to this proposal needs to think long and hard about what sort of egregious behavior would fall under the policy and what type maybe should not be covered.

**President Willis:** Okay, yes?

**A. Rosenbaum:** I would just for a moment address the point about the dangerousness here because I don’t know if I see it as that dangerous and what I would ask that since it’s my understanding, and someone can correct me if I’m wrong, that we already have some offenses that students can grieve having to do with sexual harassment or other types of behavior that would come under affirmative action kinds of groupings and I would ask if those are being abused because if we’re concerned that students are going to make stuff up in order to get back at faculty, then we would expect that are having a great number of these types of complaints being made already and I don’t know if that’s going on. If it is, I’d be interested in that. The second point that I wanted to make is that I think we have to separate out here whether we have a problem and I think the committee tried to demonstrate that there are quite a number of students that are making complaints of this nature and we have to separate out whether we have a problem form what the solution is and I think we were all in agreement that certainly the committee that comes up with some kind of a grievance procedure would have to address these issues of how do we protect faculty rights and how do we avoid false accusations. That’s no different from what happens in the court systems in the country. You know, people can misuse that as well and it’s the job of the justice system to make sure that there’s at least a reasonable policy or procedure for sorting this out so I don’t see this as any different from any other problem that we have.

**President Willis:** Pat and then Bill.

**P. Henry:** Just a quick point to, I think 3 and 5 there may be some overlap in dealing with grade appeals and that capricious grading is already being supposedly dealt with. I think in my – it
really does seem like there’s areas where you’re really not quite sure if it’s a capricious grade or if it’s something that needs to be dealt with through a grievance procedure which is this.

**President Willis:** Yes, Bill?

**B. Tolhurst:** I’m not entirely sure how this grievance procedure would work because it seems to me that in many of these cases, the best solution is just to get the student out of the class and into another situation that will serve his or her needs whereas with faculty grieving against administrators, there are other kinds of things. Course assignments might be changed or something like that but it seems to me that once we see a really egregious case, the well has been poisoned, it doesn’t look as though there’s any viable solution that’s going to involve the student continuing to interact with that faculty member and the real question is whether or not there ought to be some repercussions for the faculty member if there’s a pattern here. So, I know in one case I got three students out of a class and gave them all independent studies and did it myself when I was a chair and those kind of solutions can be happening but I think we need to be real clear about what we want the grievance procedure to be, what sorts of resolutions we think the grievance procedure can effect and what will continue to have to be effected within the department by folk, you know, finding ways to take care of students usually within the help of the advising deans.

**President Willis:** I would say – I’ll get to you in a second Beth – let me remind you that what we’re talking about right now is just referring this issue to the University Council. We’re not telling them how to do it really. We’re saying that, if I understand properly, the only things we really have formal procedures for are affirmative action type complaints and we ought to have some kind of procedures in place for other types of complaints when informal procedures break down. That’s the essence I believe of what we’re doing. The details are going to be up to the Council. Okay, Beth?

**B. Miller:** I just wanted also to follow up on this issue of danger. We’re talking about recruitment, maintaining students and these kinds of things often in other avenues. We don’t have formal policies; other universities do. That’s particularly the case for graduate students for recruitment and graduate student protection. We might be able to get undergraduates out of classes; we can’t necessarily always protect our graduate students and that relationship that graduate students have with their faculty is much different than undergraduates and the power differential and the power relationships with graduate students is very, very different when they are involved with research and taking classes and I think that in those circumstances, the way the stars and moons align with those relationships is a very, very different kind of a process where our issues become much more entangled. Other universities have very clear policies about writing together, doing scholarship together, relationships together. We don’t have anything on paper and I think that that puts us at risk both in recruitment and in maintaining relationships with students when they make a choice to stay with us. I think it makes a difference when we lost undergraduates because they – I think it makes a difference when they decide whether they’re going to contribute as alumni and they’ve had bad relationships with us. So, I think are inherent dangers when we don’t have policies in place and I don’t mean to say that many of you don’t do a great job as department chairs in an informal process, but I think you don’t always know who is going to be the person in that role and you have to make sure that there is a formal
process and you also don’t always know how undergraduates look at you in a formal role. You might be the most wonderful, nice, loving, kind person but to an undergraduate you’re just a scary department chair. You’re just that person in that role and they may never know to come to you unless you have an explicit policy. I think it’s really important to look at the disenfranchised person and to have this as explicit as possible.

**President Willis:** All right, are there other comments to the issue of do we want to recommend that the University Council take a look at this? Okay, Bill?

**B. Tolhurst:** Yeah, one specifically to that issue. It strikes me from what Beth has said that the issues faced by graduate students are very different from the issues faced by undergraduates and it may be that this is best addressed by one procedure for graduate students and another for undergraduates and then the question is who should take that up. Should it go to the UCC and the Graduate Council respectively or should it be done by the University Council or should we ask someone else to take a look at these issues for these two different classes of students?

**President Willis:** Well, we can certainly – I think it should go to the University Council to decide. We can certainly point out that, you know, they may not want to do the same thing for all classes of students or for all classes of difficulties or whatever but you know, at some point we have to say okay, these people are going to handle it and we’ve just got to see what they come up with. So, all right, anything else? We ready to vote on referring this to the University Council? All those in favor say aye. Opposed? All right. All right, I will take it to the University Council.

The motion to refer to University Council passed.

**E. Rules and Governance Committee – Gretchen Bisplinghoff, Chair**

**President Willis:** Rules and Governance, Gretchen?

**G. Bisplinghoff:** In your packets for the September 3 meeting and also sent them out by e-mail, you received a copy of the revised grievance procedures which came out of about three years of work by the University Council in an ad hoc committee that was headed up by Jerry Zar and this particular document addressed various issues such as lack of – having inconsistencies, lack of clarity, lack of representation, on the lack of recourse, amongst the various documents, unfortunately we’ve had about three different NIU official documents that have grievance procedures described in them for supportive staff or for faculty, etc. So, those particular revised grievance procedures is addressing those particular issues for faculty and staff and our President, Sue Willis, served on this committee so she has the background and the history of the various issues and how they were developed. The University Council has referred this to us, to the Faculty Senate and to the other appropriate bodies for approval so that’s what we’re about today. Rules and Governance met and we considered the document and at this time we’d like to recommend that the Faculty Senate endorse the new procedures. So, I guess at this moment I could make a motion that we would endorse the new procedures? Okay, I so move.

**President Willis:** Okay, is there a second? Okay. Discussion? Yes, Carole?
C. Minor: I did read this entire document which was very difficult and I found in one place I have a question about the – page 5, it says “representation on the grievance committee – members of the grievance committee shall be drawn from the employment classifications to which the grievant and respondent belong. These three categories being recognized as faculty, operating staff, supportive professional staff. The purposes of the determining committee composition, a faculty member who has an administrative appointment, will be considered in the faculty category of his involvement in the grievance due to his or her actions as a faculty member and will be considered in the supportive professional staff category if his or her involvement is due to his or her actions as an administrator. It’s hard for me to understand why we would want to consider a faculty member in any other category than faculty member.

President Willis: Well, what we were trying to do was to avoid having another category that was administration because it just gets cumbersome. So the idea would be that someone like, for example, the Provost. If somebody was complaining about the Provost, they could complain about him in his faculty role essentially as the head academic officer or they could, you know, it could be one of the staff in his office who thought he was being mean to them and that would be more of an employee/supervisor relationship so that was the idea.

C. Minor: So an administrator who has a complaint filed against her or him would have then not other administrators necessarily on the committee but members of the supportive professional staff? There’s a – I guess I don’t support the logic of that.

President Willis: I guess all I can say about that is that – well, a number of the senior administrators are supportive professional staff. The respondent and the grievant both have the right to request that certain persons not be on the panel that hears the complaint and I guess at some level, you know, you don’t want to cut your categories too finely because you wind up with a million different committees and this is how we decided to do it. You know, we can change it if it turns out it doesn’t work. Yes, Bill?

B. Tolhurst: It seems to me there’s a huge difference between a provost and a department chair and as a former department chair, I’d rather be judged by other faculty members and I think that those faculty members would have a better understanding of both sides of it an so that what makes sense when you’re dealing with a provost may not make sense for others – other folk who might be classed as administrators. Most department chairs I know think of themselves as faculty and I was taken aback by that as well.

President Willis: I think we generally regard department chairs as being faculty. I think this was addressing administrators above the level of department chair.

B. Tolhurst: When I read it I thought department chairs were included in that class..

President Willis: We can clarify that. To me it makes more sense to start at the dean level. Above the level of department chair because we normally consider department chairs as faculty in other, you know, situations.
B. Tolhurst: So, can we move to amend the motion so as to make that clarification explicit?

President Willis: Sure.

B. Tolhurst: I so move.

President Willis: Yes, discussion?

B. Miller: If you explain that twelve-month administrative SPS thing that faculty becomes it becomes clearer.

President Willis: Maybe you could explain it because I’ve never done something like that.

B. Miller: Once you become twelve months as a faculty member, you have to become SPS.

B. Tolhurst: Department chairs don’t.

B. Miller: Some department chairs are only eleven months but once you become twelve months, then you become for Human Resources – that’s where it becomes weird. Well, in my department it’s eleven.

President Willis: We can still amend that.

B. Miller: So it’s SPS/Faculty.

President Willis: We can still amend that thing to say a faculty member who has an administrative appointment above the level of department chair.

B. Tolhurst: I’d like to retract my motion and remake it in those words.

President Willis: All right, is that okay with the seconder? Okay. All right, any further discussion? Yes?

J. Stephens: What does endorsed mean as opposed to approve?

President Willis: This is coming from the University Council. It was written by a University Council committee and it will be passed by the University Council. The University Council felt that it wanted to send this to the three representative bodies. It’s already gone to the Operating Staff Council and the Supportive Professional Staff Council both of which had a couple of minor changes to recommend but nothing of substance. They meet during the summer so that’s when they did that. Basically, the University Council would like feedback from the Senate as to whether we like it or not.

J. Stephens: So what we’re saying is okay is the change of wording as suggested by Bill?

President Willis: Yes.
B. Tolhurst: As I understand it I made a motion to amend and so the vote now would be to accept the amendment and then we would vote on the motion as amended. Is that right Ferald?

J. Stephens: Second on the motion to amend.

President Willis: All right, Paul? Is this about the amendment?

P. Stoddard: Actually whether or not we still have a quorum?

President Willis: We do have a quorum. Don’t leave. All right, so the motion on the floor is to amend that paragraph to say “a faculty member who has an administrative appointment above the level of department chair”. We’re discussing that part of the amendment. Right, just the amendment. So does anyone else have anything they want to say about the amendment before we vote on it? All right. Are we ready to vote? All those in favor of the amendment say aye. Opposed? Good, all right. Now we can go back to the original motion, which was to return this as amended to the University Council and tell them that it’s okay with us if they go ahead with it essentially. They are giving this to us basically as a courtesy. All right? They can pass it without our input; they’re asking for our input. With this modification, obviously we’re giving it to them. We can give them whatever input we want to. I’m not saying we can’t do that. I’m just saying that this is not – we’re not passing this in any way that makes it take effect. It’s going to go back to the University Council and then the Council will address it. Carole?

C. Minor: It seemed to say in the preamble or whatever this takes precedent over any other grievance procedures that are now in place including the faculty grievance procedure that’s now in place except those that have legal ramifications such as discrimination or sexual harassment. So this would be the single grievance procedure.

President Willis: Right and that was one of the main motivations for creating it in the first place because we had a bunch – we had several grievance procedures which were not necessarily consistent with each other and didn’t allow for grievances across certain categories and even if there were grievances across categories and all that. Categories were represented on the panel so that was the basic idea. All right, any other discussion of the grievance procedure? Yes, David?

D. Wagner: When is the University Council going to vote on this? This is at the end of a long meeting and I’m prepared to vote on it. You know, even if there is a quorum, it should come up at the early part of a meeting and should be discussed more substantially than we have discussed it.

President Willis: Well, the University Council has been looking at it for a long time. So, I don’t know how long it would take them to vote on it. As I said, I’ve already gotten responses from the SPS Council and the Operating Staff Council. You know, you’ve had it since, when was it the last meeting when we referred it and I said then that we were going to come back to it and to please read it. So, but anyway. Yes? Yes, you can. So all in favor of sending this back to the University Council as amended say aye. Opposed? Okay. Thank you. Gretchen, did you have anything else?
G. Bisplinghoff: No.

F. Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee – Stephen Nord, Chair

President Willis: Elections and Legislative Oversight, I believe, does not have a report.

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

President Willis: I have nothing under either Unfinished Business or New Business.

X. NEW BUSINESS

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

President Willis: Are there Comments and Questions from the Floor?

XII. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Minutes, Academic Planning Council
B. Minutes, Athletic Board minutes
C. Minutes, Campus Security and Environmental Quality
D. Minutes, Committee on Initial Teacher Certification
E. Minutes, Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum
F. Minutes, Graduate Council
G. Minutes, Undergraduate Coordinating Council minutes
H. Minutes, University Assessment Panel
I. Minutes, University Benefits Committee minutes

X. ADJOURMENT

President Willis: We are adjourned.

The meeting adjourned at 4:35 P.M.